

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

MICHAEL GOODWIN, )  
Petitioner, )  
v. ) No. 4:25-cv-00258-RWS  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
Respondent. )

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Petitioner Michael Goodwin's seventh petition for writ of error coram nobis based upon newly discovered evidence. For the following reason, Goodwin's petition for writ of error coram nobis is denied.

Goodwin has filed petitions for writ of error coram nobis six times before, and they have always been denied. *See Goodwin v. United States*, 4:16-cv-0007-SNLJ (filed Jan. 4, 2016); *Goodwin v. United States*, 4:18-cv-00011-CDP (filed Jan. 2, 2018); *Goodwin v. United States*, 4:19-cv-01893-HEA (filed Jul. 9, 2019); *United States v. Goodwin*, 4:01-cr-00173-RWS-2 (filed Sept. 8, 2021) (ECF No. 769); *Goodwin v. United States*, 4:23-cv-00230-RWS, 2023 WL 2561759 at \*3 (filed Mar. 17, 2023); *Goodwin v. United States*, 4:23-cv-00597-RWS (filed. May 4, 2023).<sup>1</sup>

Here, Goodwin attacks his criminal conviction from 2001, alleging the following statements constitute newly discovered evidence: (1) a statement from the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in its opinion dated August 20, 2010, (2) an alleged admission by the Assistant U.S.

---

<sup>1</sup> For an extensive review of the procedural history of this case, including Petitioner's first five petitions for writ of error coram nobis, see *Goodwin v. United States*, No. 4:23-cv-230-RWS, 2023 WL 2561759 (filed Mar. 17, 2023). The Court incorporates herein by reference its prior memorandum and order.

Attorney in an appellate brief filed May 14, 2010, *see United States v. Goodwin*, No. 08-3951 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. May 14, 2010), and (3) a statement by Judge Stohr in an opinion dated February 12, 2009. *See* ECF No. 1 at 2. Goodwin's alleged newly discovered evidence has been publicly available in the record of his case for nearly fifteen years. He does not address why he believes this evidence could not have been discovered sooner with reasonable diligence. Goodwin has not presented newly discovered evidence to support his claim but rather argues that he is entitled to relief based on previously disallowed basis. *See Goodwin v. United States*, 4:23-cv-230-RWS (E.D. Mo. Mar. 17, 2023).

Goodwin's has not stated a plausible claim for coram nobis relief. He has presented nothing to convince the Court that its earlier determinations were incorrect.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Petitioner's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is **GRANTED**. [ECF No. 2]

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Petitioner's petition for writ of error coram nobis is **DENIED** and this case is **DISMISSED**. [ECF No. 1]

An Order of Dismissal will accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 23rd day of May, 2025.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY W. SIPPEL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE